1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 7 8 9 WILLIAM MISIEWICZ, 10 Plaintiff, Case No. 2:13-cv-02036-APG-VCF 11 VS. ORDER 12 **BOARD OF PAROLE** COMMISSIONERS, et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 Petitioner has submitted a notice of appeal. Petitioner is attempting to appeal to this court the Nevada Supreme Court's denial of his petition for a writ of mandamus. That petition, in turn, 16 17 arose from the administrative closure of a civil action filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court of 18 the State of Nevada. 19 This Court does not have appellate jurisdiction to consider petitioner's claims. "[A]ppellate 20 jurisdiction to reverse or modify a state-court judgment is lodged, initially by § 25 of the Judiciary 21 Act of 1789, 1 Stat. 85, and now by 28 U.S.C. § 1257, exclusively in [the Supreme Court of the 22 United States]. Federal district courts . . . are empowered to exercise original, not appellate, 23 jurisdiction." Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 283 (2005). Having been unsuccessful with his petition for a writ of mandamus in state court, petitioner cannot 24 25 ask this court to overturn that denial. <u>Id.</u> at 284 (citing *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v.* Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983), Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923)). 26 27 ///

28

///

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the clerk of the court shall file the notice of appeal. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to expedite the appeal (Dkt. #2) is DENIED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction. The clerk of the court shall enter judgment accordingly. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability, to the extent one is necessary, is **DENIED**. DATED: 11th day of December, 2013 ANDREW P. GORDON United States District Judge